

~~SECRET~~

DPD-3034-59  
5 May 1959

MEMORANDUM FOR: Acting Chief, DPD-DD/P

SUBJECT : Department of Air Force Support Problems

REFERENCE : OSD Memo dated 30 March 1959, subject: Air Force Support Problems

1. B-26 Support: At the moment there is not a clear understanding as to whether we will, in the final analysis, have eight or twelve B-26 aircraft. I have talked at some length on this subject with [ ] PMD, and we have agreed to meet on or about 6 May to attempt to arrive at a firm position.

25X1

2. L-20 Aircraft, Project [ ] On 21 April 1959 a memorandum was forwarded to Directorate of Plans, USAF in which it was stated that funds in the amount of \$25,000.00 were available to cover cost of required modification of subject aircraft. The Air Force was requested to configure this aircraft to conform with current MDAP aircraft in Iran.

25X1

On 1 May [ ] received a telephone call from Lt. Colonel Prouty in which he stated that Air Force Headquarters would advise AMC/AMFEA take the necessary steps to have the modification effected and to contact EAOB for guidance. EAOB has been advised (DIR 25005, OUF 50813, 5 May 1959) of Air Force action and given guidance as to the work to be performed under this contract.

25X1

3. Project SHORELINE Technical Representatives: The following comments are submitted with reference to paragraph 2 (b) of the referenced memo:

a. The phasing-out of the Technical Representatives from this project definitely has been considered since the start of the RB-69 Program. As a matter of fact this was

25 YEAR  
RE-REVIEW

~~SECRET~~

**SECRET**

**SUBJECT: Department of Air Force Support Problems**

one of the premises upon which the Technical Representatives were justified in the early stages of planning. This was agreed upon by the Air Force and the Agency.

b. However, this was never achieved because the Air Force would not guarantee the retention of the airmen after they were trained. Neither would the Air Force guarantee replacements for these airmen when they were due to rotate to the ZI. The net result being that we have been forced to retain the Technical Representatives as an indefinite program.

The foregoing discussion is viewed entirely from the assignment of USAF maintenance technician on the basis of economy. However, consideration should also be given to the utilization of Agency civilian maintenance technicians. The use of the latter would be slightly more costly than USAF technicians but would create less of a rotational problem.

In my opinion, it would be more economical to utilize the Agency civilians from a long-term viewpoint. Additionally, I would recommend phasing-out the Technical Representatives after the replacement technicians are adequately trained----probably one year after assignment to the Technical Representatives for training.

SIGNED

Chief, Materiel Branch

25X1

Distribution:

Orig & 1 - Addressee  
1 - AMS  
1 - Materiel  
1 - Chrono  
(1) - RI

DPD/MB/AMS :ngw/4652

25X1

- 2 -

**SECRET**